

**REMARKS**

Claims in this case are 1-31, all of which are presented here for initial consideration.

All claims in the parent case were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 based on references (Beetcher and Siefert) individually or in combination.

The present claims are presented as being distinct from the references in view of the differences urged in the parent case. Specifically, the following are stressed: running an application with a single encrypted record of only a serial number and an authorization level; an electronic device that is back door enabled; a single encrypted record of the individual serial number and the authorization level to control, and claiming of the device.

Furthermore with respect to the combination of references, a guide from the recent KSR case is also suggested (*KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. et al.*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_\_ (2007)).

Specifically, in the current analysis of combining references, if the need or problem is not known in the field of endeavor at the time of invention, there may be no reason for combining references (*KSR*, pp. 16). As stated previously, the benefit of a single endpoint was not deemed to be apparent.

Respectfully submitted,

BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: October 20, 2007

By: /Byard G. Nilsson/  
Byard G. Nilsson  
Registration No. 17,350

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810  
Los Angeles, CA 90069  
(310) 247-2860